KS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/304,552	05/04/1999	PETER J. T. VAN RAVENSTEIN	PHN16.914	9833

26646 7590 11/03/2003

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER	
VO, TUNG T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	26

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

KS

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/304,552	VAN RAVENSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tung T. Vo	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US5,657,076) in view of Johnson (US 6,175,373) as set forth in the previous Office Action, Paper No. 20, and the discussion follows.

Re claims 1-9, the combination of Tapp and Johnson teaches a security control system comprises all limitations as set forth in the previous Office Action, Paper No. 20.

Re claims 13-14, Tapp further teaches the PIP of the TV (36 of fig. 4) display the live image events recorded from the recorder (70 of fig. 4), while the live image is being displayed, the recorder (70 of fig. 4) is also recording the live image.

Re claims 10-12, the combination of Tapp and Johnson further discloses wherein the plurality images (frames) includes images preceding the event (first, second and third frame), wherein the sequence is displayed in PIP form, and where in the case of multiple events, a sequence including a latest of the multiple events is repeatedly displayed (126 of fig. 3; col. 4, lines 47-52) as suggested by Johnson. Johnson further teaches the contents of buffer B3 are repeatedly displayed to the display monitor, which is interpreted as the frame of the occurrence events is repeated displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 1, see also col. 4, lines 57-65).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08/15/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that the Johnson discloses only one of the video data portion in the buffer is selectively display to provide live video on a computer system. Thus Johnson is directed to addressing an entirely different problem than is addressed by presently claimed subject matter in which a sequence formed by a plurality of image is display upon occurrence on the event. Accordingly, a person having ordinary skill would not motivated to combine the references (Johnson and Tapp) to provide the presently claimed subject matter, pages 6 and 7 of the remarks 6 and 7.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tapp teaches the television monitor (36 of fig. 1) that displays multi-video sources that are provided from the cameras as the PIP monitor (PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (112, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras, wherein the monitor display (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based upon the event (col. 4, lines 15-20), this suggests that multiple display formats would be in single image of full screen or a sub-sampled image as desirable.

Johnson teaches the PIP (126 and 131 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying the portion, first complete frame, second complete frame, and third complete frame, from a buffer (col. 6, lines 39-63), wherein the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames (images), first, second, third

complete frames. Since Tapp suggests that the display (36) displays the multiple display-formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance, and Johnson uses the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the frame provided from the buffer B3 and the sequence is formed of a plurality of frames also being repeatedly displayed on the PIP (126 of fig. 3, col. 4, lines 58-67).

Moreover, Johnson further suggests all such extensions, modifications, rearrangements, substitutions and combinations are contemplated to be part of the disclosed system (col. 5, lines 60-64). Tapp also suggests the various changes, substitutions, and alternations can be made for the security and surveillance system (col. 4, lines 56-59). Therefore, one skill in the art would combine Tap and Johnson to make obvious the claimed invention. In view of the discussion above, the claimed features are unpatentable over Tapp, Johnson, and combination of Tapp and Johnson.

In further response to applicant's argument, page 5 of the remarks, that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Tapp and Johnson both suggest the monitor to display the image signal captured from the camera.

The obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F. 2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCAP 1969).

The applicant further pointed out that the ***"prima facie"***, pages 7-11 of the remarks. It has been considered, but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-5874. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris. Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Tung T. Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2613

T.Vo

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600